[29th November 1928

Water-rate

Assessment of lands in Tanjore district.

*989 *Q.*—Rajkumar S. N. DORAI RAJA: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased—

(i) to call for and lay on the table rent roll irrigation source and soil-war area classification and assessments of Ekabogam ryotwari villages in Tanjore, Trichinopoly and Madura districts, wherein all lands are monopolized by five or ten landholders; and

(ii) to state whether it is a fact that lands in the soilwar classification area are assessed at far lower rates in well-to-do villages than similar lands occupied by poor miscellaneous pattadars in other adjacent villages of all firkas in Tanjore and Trichinopoly districts?

A.—The Board of Revenue has been asked to report the information required in clause (i) if it is readily available; and to report on the allegation in clause (ii).

Rajkumar S. N. DORAI RAJA:—"Will the hon. the Revenue Member be pleased to see that the reports are made available to the Members before the next meeting of the Council."

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"The Government will do their best, Sir."

Proposed transfer of Kontivada zamin in West Godavari district from Schedule A to B under the Irrigation Cess Act.

*990 *Q.*—Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU: With reference to the Revenue Department notification No. 220 published at page 1194 of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 7th August 1928, will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether Government will be pleased to place on the table of the House all the material papers upon which the proposal to transfer Kontivada zamin in West Godavari district from Schedule A to B under the Irrigation Cess Act, 1865, is based;

(*b*) whether the notification referred to in (*a*) has been published in Telugu in the *West Godavari District Gazette* and in Kontivada village office and, if so, on what date or dates;

(*c*) before what date the ryots of Kontivada zamin have to submit their objections to the said proposal;

(*d*) why it is that in the notification referred to above objections are called for in respect of individual fields instead of in respect of the proposal for transfer as a whole;

(*e*) whether it is a fact that a similar request for transfer preferred by the proprietor in 1927 was rejected both by the Board of Revenue and the Collector, West Godavari district; and

(*f*) if the answer to (*e*) be in the affirmative, what has since happened that those two authorities should now change their attitude and recommend the proposal to Government?

A.—(*a*), (*e*) & (*f*) A copy of the report from the Board of Revenue, No. H. 7221/27-3, dated 13th July 1928, and its enclosures are laid on the table. [a]

---

[a] Printed as Appendix XXI on pages 549—554 infra.

29th November 1928]

(*b*) The notification was published in the *West Godavari District Gazette* on 8th October 1928 in Telugu. As regards its publication in the village office the Government have no information.

(*c*) Before 8th December 1928.

(*d*) As the mamul wet lands in the estate have been localized and as the record of rights prepared for the estate has become final, it would seem to be now in order to invite and consider individual objections. The objections might not be common to all the lands in the estate.

Settlement

Enquiry into the conduct of a village munsif by the Tahsildar of Bhimavaram.

* 991 Q.—Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Tahsildar, Bhimavaram, is actively engaged in making enquiries whether a certain village munsif is in any way connected with the representations made to Government by the people in West Godavari district regarding resettlement proposals;

(*b*) if the answer to (*a*) be in the affirmative, at whose instance and with what object the enquiry has been undertaken; and

(*c*) whether village munsifs are prohibited from associating themselves with representations made to Government regarding resettlement proposals?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government do not know whether this is so or not.

(*c*) There is no such prohibition.

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU:—" With reference to the answer to clauses (*a*) and (*b*), may I know whether the Government will be pleased to call for the information?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—" No, Sir."

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU:—" May I know why the Government refuse to call for the information?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—" Because there is nothing wrong in a tahsildar making enquiries concerning the activities of one of his subordinates."

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU:—" In answer to clause (*c*), the Government have stated that there is no prohibition in the matter of village munsifs associating themselves with representations made to Government regarding resettlement proposals. In that case where is the necessity for the tahsildar to make enquiries of that kind?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—" We do not know what the scope of the enquiry is."

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU:—" Therefore, will the Government be pleased to ascertain the scope of the enquiry now being made by the tahsildar?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—" There is no reason to suppose that he is enquiring with the object of enforcing a prohibition that does not exist."